



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/911,532	07/24/2001	John A. Wheatley	54358USA5J.067	4765

32692 7590 11/05/2002

3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY
PO BOX 33427
ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427

EXAMINER

SHAFFER, RICKY D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2872

DATE MAILED: 11/05/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/911,532

Applicant(s)

WHEATLEY ET AL

Examiner

R.D. SHAFER

Group Art Unit

2872

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address —

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/23/02
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 30-40 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☒ Claim(s) 30-40 are subject to restriction or election requirement

Application Papers

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____
- ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2872

1. The restriction requirement set forth in Paper No. 10 is withdrawn in view of the presence of some topographical errors which may affect applicant's election of a particular invention.

Accordingly, a corrected restriction requirement follows. The examiner apologizes for any inconvenience.

2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 30, 30(32), 30(33), 30(34) and 30(35), drawn to a multilayer interference film comprising alternating layers of at least first and second diverse polymeric materials having a refractive index mismatch in at least a first plane perpendicular to the film, so as to reflect light over a range of wavelengths, wherein at least one of the first or second materials comprises a polymer selected from the group of polyethylene naphthalate and a copolymer thereof, classified in class 359, subclass 589.

II. Claims 31, 31(32), 31(33), 31(34), 31(35) and 36-40, drawn to a multilayer interference or reflective film having at least first and second diverse polymeric materials, so as to reflect light having a first polarization, wherein at least one of the first or second materials comprises a polymer selected from the group of polyethylene naphthalate and a copolymer thereof, classified in class 359, subclass 500.

3. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single

Art Unit: 2872

combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention I has separate utility such as a multilayer interference film without being polarization sensitive (i.e. without reflect light having a first polarization) See MPEP § 806.05(d).

4. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and/or have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

5. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

A). The refractive indices of the first and second diverse polymeric materials being substantially equal in one plane and different in another plane different from said one plane.

B). The refractive indices of the first and second diverse polymeric materials being substantially different in one plane and different in another plane different from said one plane.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, several claims are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon,

Art Unit: 2872

including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(I).

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to R.D. Shafer whose telephone number is (703) 308-4813.

RDS // November 2, 2002


RICHARD D. SHAFFER
PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2872